



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,968	11/26/2003	Ronald D. Riker	RIKE 02908 PTUS	9513
32233	7590	04/22/2005	EXAMINER	
STORM L.L.P. BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA 901 MAIN STREET, SUITE 7100 DALLAS, TX 75202			PECHHOLD, ALEXANDRA K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3671	

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/723,968

Applicant(s)

RIKER, RONALD D.

Examiner

Alexandra K Pechhold

Art Unit

3671

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hubbell et al (US 6,409,433) in view of Kubicky (US 6,322,863).**

Regarding claim 1, Hubbell discloses a post capable of being used adjacent roadways for supporting an object, comprising:

- a hollow continuous sleeve, seen as the shell of epoxy resin (7),
- a continuous core within the sleeve, seen as structural tubular element (4), seen as coextensive with the interior of the sleeve, and can be made of rubber (Col 6, line 8).

Hubbell fails to disclose the rubber in element (4) as having a recycled rubber component thereto. Kubicky teaches using recycled scarp tires for a utility pole, thereby providing a use for disposed scrap tires, saving forests, and do not have the environmental and structural problems of creosote covered wooden poles, aluminum poles, or concrete poles (Col 2, lines 1-25). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the rubber of

Hubbell to have a recycled rubber component as taught by Kubicky, since Kubicky notes the environmental advantages of reusing discarded tires in column 2, lines 1-16.

Regarding claim 9, Hubbell discloses the limitations of the claimed invention as discussed with respect to claims 1 and 2 above. Hubbell fails to disclose the rubber in element (4) as having a 10% recycled rubber component thereto. Kubicky teaches using recycled scarp tires for a utility pole, thereby providing a use for disposed scrap tires, saving forests, and do not have the environmental and structural problems of creosote covered wooden poles, aluminum poles, or concrete poles (Col 2, lines 1-25). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the rubber of Hubbell to have a recycled rubber component as taught by Kubicky that is 10% by weight recycled rubber, since Kubicky notes the environmental advantages of reusing discarded tires in column 2, lines 1-16, and it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F. 2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Regarding claims 16 and 18, Hubbell discloses a continuous sleeve with a circular cross section, and a hollow core coextensive with the sleeve interior as discussed with regards to claim 1 above and seen in Fig. 1. Hubbell discloses the core (4) as plastic (Col 6, line 8), thereby meeting the polymer limitation. Hubbell fails to disclose the core (4) being at least 10% or 20% by weight recycled crumb rubber and the balance as a low-melt index polyethylene, though Hubbell does disclose that core (4) can be made of various materials, such as plastic and rubber (Col 6, lines 7-9), and

Art Unit: 3671

polyethylene is a type of plastic. Hubbell fails to disclose that layer (7) is high-density polyethylene, instead disclosing that (7) "can be composed for resin, for example epoxy resin and the like." (Col 6, lines 29-31). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the layer (7) of Hubbell to be high density polyethylene, since Hubbell broadly discloses that the layer (7) may be a type of resin "and the like", which has the similar advantageous structural and durability qualities of high density polyethylene. Kubicky teaches using recycled scarp tires for a utility pole, thereby providing a use for disposed scrap tires, saving forests, and do not have the environmental and structural problems of creosote covered wooden poles, aluminum poles, or concrete poles (Col 2, lines 1-25). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the rubber and plastic core of Hubbell to have a recycled component thereto as taught by Kubicky, and having at least 10% or 20% by weight recycled rubber, since Kubicky notes the environmental advantages of reusing discarded materials in column 2, lines 1-16, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F. 2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Regarding claims 2, 15, and 20, Figs. 1 and 2 of Hubbell illustrate the (7) and (4) as circular and (4) as hollow.

Regarding claims 3 and 10, Hubbell fails to disclose that (7) is high density polyethylene, instead disclosing that (7) "can be composed for resin, for example epoxy resin and the like." (Col 6, lines 29-31). It would have been obvious to one having

Art Unit: 3671

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the layer (7) of Hubbell to be high density polyethylene, since Hubbell broadly discloses that the layer (7) may be a type of resin “and the like”, which has the similar advantageous structural and durability qualities of high density polyethylene.

Regarding claims 4, 5, and 11, Hubbell discloses that core (4) can be composed of various materials, such as concrete, plastic, rubber, structural foam, etc. (Col 6, lines 7-9), which therefore could include a combination of rubber and thermoplastic resin. Hubbell does not disclose that any of these materials are recycled, nor having a certain percentage (10% or 20%) of recycled rubber. Kubicky teaches using recycled scarp tires for a utility pole, thereby providing a use for disposed scrap tires, saving forests, and do not have the environmental and structural problems of creosote covered wooden poles, aluminum poles, or concrete poles (Col 2, lines 1-25). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the rubber and thermoplastic core of Hubbell to have a recycled component thereto as taught by Kubicky, and having the mixture comprise 10% or 20% by weight recycled rubber, since Kubicky notes the environmental advantages of reusing discarded materials in column 2, lines 1-16, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F. 2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Regarding claims 8, 14, and 17, Hubbell fails to disclose the post having crash properties conforming to NCHRP Report 350. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the post of

Art Unit: 3671

Hubbell to have crash properties conforming to NCHRP Report 350, since the applicant states in the specification that the standards have been adopted by most states.

Regarding claims 7 and 13, Hansen fails to disclose the sleeve and core as coextruded, instead forming and attaching the layer (7) to the inner core (4) (Col 6, lines 43-57). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the means by which the core and layer of Hansen are made and joined so that they are coextruded, since either process would still result in the same finished product with the layer (7) being joined directly against the core (4) with no disjunction or disjointedness, since the Figures show a direct continuous interface between these layers.

3. **Claims 6, 12, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hubbell et al (US 6,409,433) and Kubicky (US 6,322,863) as applied to claims 1, 9, and 16, respectively above, and further in view of Hansen (US 2003/0072904).** The combination of Hubbell and Kubicky fails to disclose Hansen discloses a highway sign of an area of less than 10 sq. ft. Hansen teaches a utility pole, guardrail, a signpost, and may be suitable for many other construction applications (para. 20), much like the pile structure of Hubbell. Hansen fails to disclose the area of the signpost. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hubbell to support a signpost as taught by Hansen, since Hansen states in para. 20 the multiple uses of such a pole or post, such as supporting a sign, and with respect to the 10 sq. ft size, discovering an optimum

value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F. 2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed 3/15/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Hubbell contemplates a jointed structure, as opposed to the claimed structure, which is continuous along its length (specifically without joints). But the Examiner would like to point out that applicant's independent claims merely recite "[a] post...comprising: a hollow, continuous sleeve...and a continuous core...". And Hubbell discloses such a post, seen as a foundation pile structure. Whatever length of Hubbell's pile is a continuous structure is what is being viewed as applicant's claimed post. Just because Hubbell may contemplate sections of pile joined together is irrelevant to the scope of applicant's claim, since a single section of the pile can be viewed as meeting the claimed invention.

Applicant also argues that Hubbell has only the vaguest description of the composition of its "structural tubular element 4" as being "various materials" for example "concrete, plastic, rubber, structural foam, etc." (Col 5, lines 6-9). Although Hubbell discloses more options for the material that can be used, Hubbell still discloses rubber. Therefore, the fact that Hubbell discloses additional material options that are not part of applicant's invention is irrelevant.



Applicant's final argument is that Hubbell is non-analogous art, and the present invention is subjected to both axial loads as well as bending loads. The Examiner does not find this argument persuasive, since the applicant's claim language simply is directed at "a post", with an intended use recitation "for use adjacent roadways for supporting an object", which the pile of Hubbell merely has to be capable of doing, which it is. The broad language of applicant's claims does not prevent the Examiner from applying the art of Hubbell, Kubicky, and Hansen.

### ***Conclusion***


5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3671

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexandra Pechhold whose telephone number is (571) 272-6994. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs. from 8:00am to 5:30pm and alternating Fridays from 8:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas B. Will, can be reached on (571) 272-6998. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.



Thomas B. Will  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Group 3600

AKP  
4/13/05